Team Leaders: Chris and Miriam
Participants: 4 parents, 1 FES and parent, 3 district staff persons

<u>Meeting notes:</u>
1. The objectives of the discussion were presented by the team leaders:
    a. The community will look at data, digest them, and provide feedback to the DO.
    b. The group (community and DO) will examine indicators for patterns and trends.
    c. Build awareness and understanding of data. There is to be no judgement. It's an opportunity to share viewpoints and predictions.
2. The discussion leader indicated that data presented contain both local measure and state measures
    a. State data is collected by the state; local data is collected locally which we have discretion on how to collect.
3. The community was asked to look at the *California Dashboard Data Packet, Fall 2017 release* and respond to these prompts: (i) What do you expect to see in the data presented, read, think about, and note what is surprising, (ii) why do you think the data is as is, why are the patterns there, and (iii) generate inferences, what is causing trends/changes you see i.e. inferences on causation. Below are the discussion points:
    a. Unequal level of connectedness, possibly because of culture, privilege, and access.
    b. Connections with caring adults is different between K-5 and higher grades. The ratio tends to go down as students progress through the years. 64% in 5th grade is lower than expected. Possible explanation: K-5 students are still in their own community, same school, same students in grade, more parent involvement, same school culture, very inclusive etc. Going to middle school means interactions with a larger student population with students comes from different schools, many changes in environment, unconscious racism that is not acknowledged in the original K-5 school now becomes more apparent in the bigger middle school environment.

c. 51% of students in G6-12 reported a caring and environment i.e. half of our students do not think there is a caring environment or not super connected.

d. Lack of responsiveness could contribute to data collection.

e. Kids don't want to go to school because they don't feel included.

f. Low prediction of absenteeism, because of inequity and lack of engagement.

g. What is breakdown of race, gender, special ed in absenteeism data?

h. The data on chronic absenteeism on status and change section: State in the past does not collect data, but expect that to change in the future.

i. Absenteeism data, why N/A? This package was made as soon as it was released. The absenteeism was not released yet at the time of publication of the document, but now it is on the site. Next year, the absenteeism will have pie charts.

j. DO is mandated to report suspension of student. Even if you are suspended multiple times it is counted as one suspension, unless you change school. # reflects # of students suspended, not # of time.

k. Connectedness becomes less or chronic when you are suspended several times.

l. African American suspension is alarming, in the red. Are they well served?

m. Homeless have increasing suspension.

n. Suspension rates in language arts, Math?

o. Status and change tab compares school year 15-16 and 16-17 years on every state indicator.

p. Breakdown by race: sub groups are defined by state, screen shots are taken directly from site.

q. Other subgroups for our district as reported by the state: EL, SWD etc.

r. How do these groups perform per these indicators?

s. 5x5 data: the state has defined these measures, look at data across the state, make cut points, based on data across state, how PAUSD performs relative to each cut point.

t. No indicators in gender. Not impacted? Perhaps it's something to look in the future

u. Asians category rate highly. Will be interesting to see why this subgroup is doing positively for other groups to model.

v. Nothing is genuinely surprising, African suspension and connection to adult is not reassuring to a parent.

w. If fewer than 30 students in a subgroup, do not get a count.

x. For EL, most of subgroups data declined or significantly declined, getting worse.

     y. "Lanes" in upper grade affects racism, disability differences.

     z. Do not recognize or implement effective intervention for students at risk.

     aa. Additional data on gender, geography, college-bound, college information will be helpful.

     bb. Suspended students - how to welcome them back in, what is the process, may affect whether they will be suspended again. Suspension affects absenteeism.

     cc. Curious about the intersection of the categories, gender, SED, ELL, LGBT, race etc.

4. Looking at the inferences and causes, what are some potential recommendations and solutions? Also how do we know if the solutions are working?

     a. Parent engagement - find out why there are problems of absenteeism etc.

     b. Needs to be more than outreach, needs engagement and pay attention to inclusion.

     c. Measure compliance with IEPs, and following up on IEP.

     d. Make sure there are interventions and RTI (responses to interventions).

     e. Don't over identify.

     f. Are there any advisory mentoring programs to help students be more connected to schools?

     g. Important to communicate and build relationships between students, family, school, district.

     h. Connect families directly to support for mental health, suspension etc..

     i. Engagement must be an environment that is comfortable to the parents. Use online resources?

     j. School nurse at every site - deal with chronic, physical issues related to absenteeism.

     k. Look at low resource schools that are over performing in those categories or doing well. Duplicate or model?

5. What are the high level take-aways about school culture:

     a. This is an opportunity to look deeper.

     b. There are distinct takeaways: distinctive (big) disparities with connectedness, absenteeism across subgroups.

     c. Data is good, but to get constructive feedback, need to take it to where they are, what this means to the affected groups and get critical feedback.

     d. Students need to be heard about this process - student voice is critical.

     e. Empowered and support students; how they get complaints through, transparency etc.

     f. Need to make data comprehensible to all; share out from group.